

From Page 1
To Page 3

HARTFORD, CONN.
TIMES

E-133,310

JUL 15 1968

Ohio Senator Hits Dodd's Lawyers

By ROBERT D. BYRNES — intimidation."

WASHINGTON—Sen. Stephen M. Young, D-Ohio, Thursday in a brief Senate speech attacked the conduct of lawyers for Sen. Thomas J. Dodd, D-Conn., in the inquiry being made by the Senate Ethics Committee into allegations on Dodd's conduct made by columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson.

Young's speech, made shortly before the Senate went into closed session for debate on congressional oversight of the Central Intelligence Agency, brought no immediate comment from other senators.

Young cited reports of alleged attempts to intimidate anti-Dodd witnesses and said he requested "that it be ascertained whether these cases constitute contempt of the Senate and whether the FBI has investigated these charges of in-

Young attacked what he called "the sinister type of interrogation" conducted by John F. Sonnett, Dodd's chief counsel. Young said Sonnett "attempted to attack the reputations of young women witnesses by innuendo, even indulging in the improper inquiry as to whether they intended to marry certain persons. Mr. Sonnett should know this is improper and irrelevant to the issue and is a course of conduct unbecoming a gentleman or a good trial lawyer."

"It is said", Young charged, "that employers of certain witnesses have been telephoned and asked that they discharge such employees. This is the equivalent of blacklisting, which under certain circumstances is a criminal offense."

Young quoted a newspaper re-

port of the statement by Michael O'Hare, one of Dodd's former employees who was involved in removal of Dodd's papers, of a telephone call he had received from Walter J. Kenny of the law firm representing Dodd. Young said this alleged telephone conversation was followed "by the indefensible act of a combative young man," referring to a statement to O'Hare in a Senate cafeteria by Dodd's son Jeremy.

Young noted the cafeteria incident had brought an apology and said "an apology is no substitute for the law and the rules of proper procedure at judicial or quasi-judicial proceedings." "Intimidation of the sort reported," Young said, "is highly reprehensible in any judgment and would be prejudicial to the administration of justice from every standpoint."